

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.: NAT115-05842  
U.S. SERIAL NO. 10/821,491  
PATENT

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-4 and 21-36 are pending, and were each rejected.

Claims 5-20 were previously cancelled without prejudice.

Claims 1-4 have been rejected. No claims have been allowed.

Reconsideration of Claims 1-4 and Claims 21-36 is respectfully requested.

**35 U.S.C. § 102(b) Anticipation**

On Pages 2-3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by United States Patent No. 5,427,666 to *Mueller et al.* (hereafter "Mueller"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's position that the Applicants' invention is anticipated by the Mueller reference. The Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of Claim 1 in view of the Applicants' arguments.

It is axiomatic that a prior art reference anticipates the claimed invention under 35 U.S.C. § 102 only if every element of a claimed invention is identically shown in that single reference, arranged as they are in the claims. MPEP § 2131; *See, In re King*, 231 USPQ 136, 138 (Fed. Cir. 1986) (citing with approval, *Lindemann Maschinenfabrik v. American Hoist and Derrick*, 221 USPQ 481, 485 (Fed. Cir. 1984)); *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 832, 15 USPQ2d 1566, 1567 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Anticipation is only shown where each and every limitation of the claimed invention is found in a single prior art reference. MPEP § 2131; *In re Donohue*, 766 F.2d 531, 534, 226 USPQ 619, 621 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.: NATI15-05842  
U.S. SERIAL NO. 10/821,491  
PATENT

With respect to Claim 1, a determination of anticipation in accordance with Section 102 requires that each feature claimed therein be described in sufficient detail in Mueller to enable one of ordinary skill in the art to make and practice the claimed invention.

The Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's assertions regarding the subject matter disclosed in the Mueller reference. The Applicants respectfully submit that the Mueller reference does not show each and every limitation of the Applicants' invention. The Applicants direct the Examiner's attention to Claim 1, which contains unique and novel limitations:

1. (Original) In a semiconductor device of the type comprising a via wherein said via comprises a layer of titanium placed over a layer of anti-reflective coating (ARC) titanium nitride, a method for preventing a contaminant within said layer of anti-reflective coating (ARC) titanium nitride from combining with portions of said layer of titanium, said method comprising the steps of:  
applying a nitrogen plasma to said layer of titanium; and  
converting said layer of titanium to a first layer of titanium nitride;  
wherein said contaminant does not chemically react with said first layer of titanium nitride. (Emphasis added).

The Examiner stated that "Mueller shows the method as claimed in figure 3B and corresponding text, with TiN (ARC) 58 and Ti layer 60, which protects the layer 58 from contaminants. Nitrogen plasma is used to form the TiN." (Office Action, Page 3, Lines 1-3). The Applicants respectfully traverse these conclusions of the Examiner for the following reasons.

The Mueller reference identifies an unwanted contaminant layer 50 of titanium nitride (TiN) in the prior art structure shown in FIGURE 3A. The Mueller reference provides a method for solving the prior art TiN contamination problem. "The present invention [Mueller] solves the

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.: NATI15-05842  
U.S. SERIAL NO. 10/821,491  
PATENT

TiN contamination problem by utilizing a unique and novel processing step.” (Mueller, Column 4, Lines 63-64).

The Mueller reference describes a method for applying a titanium layer 60 to a layer of TiN anti-reflective coating 58. Mueller states “As shown in FIG. 3B, after a layer of TiN anti-reflective coating 58 is deposited on the silicon wafer, an additional thin Ti layer 60 is deposited on top of the anti-reflective coating layer 58. This cleaning step for the Ti target is necessary only when Ti and TiN are deposited on the surface of a silicon wafer in the same process chamber. . . . [A]fter the anti-reflective coating of TiN [TiN layer 58] is deposited, a thin layer of Ti [Ti layer 60] is deposited on top of the TiN layer [TiN layer 58]. This additional Ti deposition [Ti layer 60] constitutes the final step for the TiN ARC deposition process. It removes the contaminant TiN layer on the target surface and presents a clean target ready to be used in processing the next wafer.” (Mueller, Column 4, Line 65 to Column 5, Line 12) (Emphasis added).

A careful reading of the Mueller reference shows that, unlike the Applicants' method as claimed in Claim 1, the Mueller method does not apply a nitrogen plasma to Ti layer 60. Mueller states that the deposition of the Ti layer 60 is the final step in the Mueller method. No further processing takes place. Furthermore, unlike the Applicants' method as claimed in Claim 1, the Mueller method does not convert the Ti layer 60 to titanium nitride (TiN).

In the Mueller method the contaminant is titanium nitride (TiN). The Mueller reference states “The Ti layer 60 deposited on the silicon wafer over the TiN [TiN layer 58] contains a small amount of impurity of TiN which is removed from the target surface.” (Mueller, Column 5,

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.: NATI15-05842  
U.S. SERIAL NO. 10/821,491  
PATENT

Lines 15-17). The TiN on the target surface is also referred to as a "contaminant TiN layer."  
(Mueller, Column 5, Lines 10-12).

Claim 1 is directed to a method for preventing a contaminant within a layer of anti-reflective coating (ARC) titanium nitride (analogous to ARC TiN layer 58) from combining with portions of a titanium layer (analogous to titanium layer 60) placed over the anti-reflective coating (ARC) titanium nitride. There is no "contaminant" in the ARC TiN layer 58 of Mueller because the entire layer 58 is made of titanium nitride.

The Examiner also stated that the titanium layer 60 of Mueller protects the ARC TiN layer 58 from contaminants. Even if this were so, it is clear that the contaminants would be external to the titanium layer 60. The protection, if any, provided by titanium layer 60 to the ARC TiN layer 58 is not relevant to a method that prevents a contaminant within an ARC TiN layer from combining with portions of a titanium layer placed over the ARC TiN layer.

The Mueller method does not anticipate the Applicants' method because (1) Mueller does not describe any contaminant within the ARC TiN layer 58, and (2) Mueller only describes a titanium nitride (TiN) contaminant within the titanium layer 60, and (3) Mueller does not apply a nitrogen plasma to titanium (Ti) layer 60, and (4) Mueller does not convert the titanium (Ti) layer 60 to titanium nitride (TiN).

The Examiner responds with a rationale that is objectively unreasonable. The Examiner states that "Applicant's claimed invention does not preclude the contaminant being TiN or, [sic] any

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.: NATI15-05842  
U.S. SERIAL NO. 10/821,491  
PATENT

other element in the broadest interpretation." Claim 1 describes a "method for preventing a contaminant within said layer of anti-reflective coating (ARC) titanium nitride". The Examiner argues that TiN is a contaminant in a TiN layer. This is not a reasonable interpretation of the plain meaning of "contaminant".

The Examiner further states that "The application of nitrogen plasma to the layer of titanium in its broadest interpretation includes the deposition process to form the TiN layer 58." This is also an objectively unreasonable interpretation. No one of skill in the art would believe that the claimed "converting said layer of titanium to a first layer of titanium nitride" somehow "includes" Mueller's express teaching of depositing a separate TiN layer. The Examiner is cordially requested to show any reference anywhere in which "converting a layer" in a semiconductor is used to describe depositing a layer.

The Examiner's response repeatedly refers to "the broadest interpretation", while ignoring the entire requirement, as described in MPEP 2111: During patent examination, the pending claims must be "given their broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification." *In re Hyatt*, 211 F.3d 1367, 1372, 54 USPQ2d 1664, 1667 (Fed. Cir. 2000) (emphasis added). Further, "The broadest reasonable interpretation of the claims must also be consistent with the interpretation that those skilled in the art would reach." *In re Cortright*, 165 F.3d 1353, 1359, 49 USPQ2d 1464, 1468 (Fed. Cir. 1999) (emphasis added).

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.: NATI15-05842  
U.S. SERIAL NO. 10/821,491  
PATENT

The Examiner attempts to contort the plain meaning of the claim terms in order to force them to read on Mueller. The interpretations used by the Examiner are neither reasonable nor consistent with the interpretation that those skilled in the art would reach.

For the reasons set forth above, the Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Allowance of Claim 1 is respectfully requested.

**35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Obviousness**

On Pages 3-5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 2-4 and 21-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent No. 5,427,666 to Mueller in view of United States Patent No. 6,399,508 to *Ting et al.* (hereafter, "Ting"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's position that the Applicants' invention is obvious in view of the Mueller reference and the Ting reference. The Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of Claims 2-4 and 21-36 in view of the Applicants' arguments.

During *ex parte* examinations of patent applications, the Patent Office bears the burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness. MPEP § 2142; *In re Fritch*, 972 F.2d 1260, 1262, 23 USPQ2d 1780, 1783 (Fed. Cir. 1992). The initial burden of establishing a *prima facie* basis to deny patentability to a claimed invention is always upon the Patent Office. MPEP § 2142; *In re Attacker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 1445, 24 USPQ2d 1443, 1444 (Fed. Cir. 1992); *In re Passaic*, 745 F.2d

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.: NATJ15-05842  
U.S. SERIAL NO. 10/821,491  
PATENT

1468, 1472, 223 USPQ 785, 788 (Fed. Cir. 1984). Only when a *prima facie* case of obviousness is established does the burden shift to the applicant to produce evidence of non-obviousness. MPEP § 2142; *In re Attacker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 1445, 24 USPQ2d 1443, 1444 (Fed. Cir. 1992); *In re Rijckaert*, 9 F.3d 1531, 1532, 28 USPQ2d 1955, 1956 (Fed. Cir. 1993). If the Patent Office does not produce a *prima facie* case of unpatentability, then without more the applicant is entitled to grant of a patent. *In re Attacker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 1445, 24 USPQ2d 1443, 1444 (Fed. Cir. 1992); *In re Grabiak*, 769 F.2d 729, 733, 226 USPQ 870, 873 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

A *prima facie* case of obviousness is established when the teachings of the prior art itself suggest the claimed subject matter to a person of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Bell*, 991 F.2d 781, 783, 26 USPQ2d 1529, 1531 (Fed. Cir. 1993). To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed invention and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not be based on an applicant's disclosure. MPEP § 2142.

For the reasons set forth below the Applicants respectfully submit that the Patent Office has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to Claims 2-4 and 21-36 of the Applicants' invention. In rejecting Claims 2-4 and 21-36 the Examiner stated:

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.: NATI15-05842  
U.S. SERIAL NO. 10/821,491  
PATENT

Mueller shows the method substantially as claimed and as described in the previous paragraphs.

Mueller lacks anticipation only in not teaching that the contaminant may be fluorine and that the application of the nitrogen plasma increases a temperature of the semiconductor device to approx. 400 degrees C; placing a dielectric layer over the layer of anti-reflective coating (ARC) titanium nitride and the fabrication of the via passage by depositing a dielectric layer over a TiN ARC layer, performing a mask and etch procedure to etch through the layer of TiN anti-reflective coating (ARC).

Ting teaches etching of TiN and TiN in a fluorine atmosphere to pattern the layers. Ting also teaches the use of a dielectric layer 140 to pattern the ARC layer 130. Additionally, Ting teaches the fabrication of the via passage by depositing a dielectric layer over a TiN ARC layer, performing a mask and etch procedure to etch through the layer of TiN anti-reflective coating (ARC).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the Ti layer over the TiN ARC, as taught in Mueller, would protect the TiN layer from the damage caused by subsequent patterning using fluorine, with the motivation that the Ti layer would act as a barrier to the fluorine atoms.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have increased a temperature of a semiconductor device to approx. 400 degrees C by the application of the nitrogen plasma, in the method of Mueller, with the motivation that the plasma nitridation process may be performed conventionally while heating the substrate to such a temperature.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have fabricated the via passage by depositing a dielectric layer over a TiN ARC layer, performing a mask and etch procedure to etch through the layer of TiN anti-reflective coating (ARC), in the method of Mueller, as taught by the method of Ting, with the motivation that this patterning process would allow the via to be accurately patterned and a contact made to the underlying metal. (Office Action, Page 4)

The Applicants respectfully traverse these conclusions of the Examiner. The Applicants hereby reiterate and incorporate by reference all of the reasons and arguments previously set forth with respect to the Mueller reference in connection with the rejection of Claim 1 above. For the reasons and arguments previously set forth, the Applicants respectfully traverse the assertion of the



ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.: NATI15-05842  
U.S. SERIAL NO. 10/821,491  
PATENT

Examiner that "Mueller shows the method substantially as claimed and as described in the previous paragraphs.

The Applicants agree that the Mueller reference does not disclose any teaching that the contaminant is fluorine or any teaching concerning the application of a nitrogen plasma to increase the temperature of the semiconductor device to approximately 400 degrees Celsius, or any teaching of placing a dielectric layer over the layer of anti-reflective coating (ARC) titanium nitride and the fabrication of the via passage by depositing a dielectric layer over a TiN ARC layer, or any teaching of performing a mask and etch procedure to etch through the layer of TiN anti-reflective coating (ARC).

The Applicants respectfully submit that the Ting reference does not and can not supply the deficiencies of the Mueller reference. Ting teaches the use of a plasma generated from a source gas comprising  $\text{Cl}_2$ ,  $\text{BCl}_3$ , and  $\text{CHF}_3$  to etch an anti-reflective coating layer. (Ting, Column 6, Pages 19-20). There is no mention in Ting of fluorine being a contaminant in an anti-reflective coating (ARC) titanium nitride (TiN) layer.

The Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's assertion that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art "that the Ti layer over the TiN ARC, as taught in Mueller, would protect the TiN layer from the damage caused by subsequent patterning using fluorine, with the motivation that the Ti layer would act as a barrier to the fluorine atoms", as quoted above.

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.: NATI15-05842  
U.S. SERIAL NO. 10/821,491  
PATENT

First, the supposed motivation "that the Ti layer would act as a barrier to the fluorine atoms" is very general and does not specifically suggest combining the teachings of the Mueller reference with the teachings of the Ting reference. There must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves, or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify a reference or to combine reference teachings. The desire to have "a titanium (Ti) layer that would act as a barrier to fluorine atoms" is too general and vague to provide the requisite motivation to modify a reference or to combine reference teachings.

Second, the supposed motivation "that the Ti layer would act as a barrier to the fluorine atoms" has nothing to do with the Applicants' invention. In the Applicants' method a titanium layer 310 that is located over an ARC TiN layer 130 is converted into a titanium nitride layer 810 by the application of a nitrogen plasma. The fluorine contaminant in the Applicants' method is located in the underlying ARC TiN layer 130. There is no fluorine contaminant from an "etching" process conducted in a "fluorine atmosphere" as described by Ting. There is no "subsequent patterning using fluorine" in the Applicants' method.

The Applicants respectfully submit that one skilled in the art would not attempt to combine the teachings of the Mueller reference with the teaching of the Ting reference. The Applicants also respectfully submit that a combination of the Mueller method and the Ting method would be unworkable. The Ting method is not compatible with the Mueller method. For this reason there would be no suggestion or motivation to combine the teachings of the Ting reference with the teachings of the Mueller reference.

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.: NAT115-05842  
U.S. SERIAL NO. 10/821,491  
PATENT

In order to establish obviousness by combining references there must be some teaching or suggestion in the prior art to combine the references. *Arkie Lures, Inc. v. Gene Larew Tackle, Inc.*, 119 F.3d 953, 957, 43 USPQ2d 1294, 1297 (Fed.Cir. 1997) ("It is insufficient to establish obviousness that the separate elements of an invention existed in the prior art, absent some teaching or suggestion, in the prior art, to combine the references."); *In re Rouffet*, 149 F.3d 1350, 1355-56, 47 USPQ2d 1453, 1456 (Fed.Cir. 1998) ("When a rejection depends on a combination of prior art references, there must be some teaching, or motivation to combine the references.")

Evidence of a motivation to combine prior art references must be clear and particular if the trap of "hindsight" is to be avoided. *In re Dembiczak*, 175 F.3d 994, 50 USPQ2d 1614 (Fed.Cir. 1999) (Evidence of a suggestion, teaching or motivation to combine prior art references must be "clear and particular." "Broad conclusory statements regarding the teaching of multiple references, standing alone, are not 'evidence.'"). *In re Rouffet*, 149 F.3d 1350, 1357, 47 USPQ2d 1453, 1457 (Fed.Cir. 1998) ("[R]ejecting patents solely by finding prior art corollaries for the claimed elements would permit an examiner to use the claimed invention itself as a blueprint for piecing together elements in the prior art to defeat the patentability of the claimed invention. Such an approach would be 'an illogical and inappropriate process by which to determine patentability.'")

Further, the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit recently highlighted the standard for motivation in *In re Johnston* (Fed. Cir. 2006), referencing two cases among others: "In holding an invention obvious in view of a combination of references, there must be some suggestion, motivation, or teaching in the prior art that would have led a person of ordinary skill in the art to

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.: NATI15-05842  
U.S. SERIAL NO. 10/821,491  
PATENT

select the references and combine them in the way that would produce the claimed invention."  
*Karsten Mfg. Corp. v. Cleveland Golf Co.*, 242 F.3d 1376, 1385 (Fed. Cir. 2001) (emphasis added).  
"When the references are in the same field as that of the applicant's invention, knowledge thereof is presumed. However, the test of whether it would have been obvious to select specific teachings and combine them as did the applicant must still be met by identification of some suggestion, teaching, or motivation in the prior art, arising from what the prior art would have taught a person of ordinary skill in the field of the invention." *In re Dance*, 160 F.3d 1339, 1343 (Fed. Cir. 1998) (emphasis added).

The Applicants respectfully submit that the alleged motivation to combine references presented by the Examiner does not meet the legal requirement to establish a finding of *prima facie* obviousness. The Applicant respectfully submits that the alleged motivation to combine references is not clear and particular. The fact that two references are concerned with the same general technical area does not without more provide a "clear and particular" motivation to combine the references. The Applicant respectfully submits that the alleged motivation to combine references has been assumed by "hindsight" in light of the existence of the Applicant's invention.

Even if the Mueller reference could somehow be combined with the Ting reference, the combination would not teach, suggest, or even hint at the Applicant's invention as set forth in Claims 2-4 and 21-36. MPEP § 2142 indicates that a prior art reference (or references when two or more references are combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations of the invention. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed invention and the reasonable expectation of success

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.: NATI15-05842  
U.S. SERIAL NO. 10/821,491  
PATENT

must both be found in the prior art, and not be based on an applicant's disclosure. In the present case, the Mueller reference and the Ting reference in combination would not teach or suggest all the claim limitations of the Applicant's invention.

Lastly, the Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's assertion that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art "to have increased a temperature of the semiconductor device to approx. 400 degrees C by the application of the nitrogen plasma, in the method of Mueller, with the motivation that the plasma nitridation process may be performed conventionally while heating the substrate to such a temperature."

First, the supposed motivation "that the plasma nitridation process may be performed conventionally" is very general and does not specifically suggest modifying the teachings of the Mueller reference. There must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves, or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify a reference or to combine reference teachings. The desire to perform a "conventional plasma nitridation" is too general and vague to provide the requisite motivation to modify a reference or to combine reference teachings.

Second, combining a plasma nitridation process with the Mueller method does not overcome or supply the deficiencies of the Mueller method that have been previously described.

The Applicants note that Claims 2-4 depend directly or indirectly from Claim 1. As previously described, Claim 1 contains unique and novel claim limitations of the Applicants' invention. Therefore, Claims 2-4 also contain the same unique and novel claim limitations of

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.: NATI15-05842  
U.S. SERIAL NO. 10/821,491  
PATENT

Claim 1 and are therefore patentable over the Mueller reference and the Ting reference, either separately or in combination.

The Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1-4 are in condition for allowance. Allowance of Claims 1-4 is respectfully requested.

Claims 21-36 include, directly or indirectly, the novel claimed features as described above, and were rejected in common with claims 2-4. For the reasons set forth above, the Applicants respectfully submit that the Claims 21-36 are also in condition for allowance. Allowance of Claims 21-36 is also respectfully requested.

The Applicants' attorney has made the amendments and arguments set forth above in order to place this Application in condition for allowance. In the alternative, the Applicants' attorney has made the amendments and arguments to properly frame the issues for appeal. In this Amendment, the Applicants make no admission concerning any now moot rejection or objection, and affirmatively deny any position, statement or averment of the Examiner that was not specifically addressed herein.

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.: NATI15-05842  
U.S. SERIAL NO. 10/821,491  
PATENT

**SUMMARY**

Entry of this amendment is respectfully requested. If any outstanding issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting prosecution of this Application, the Applicants respectfully invite the Examiner to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below or at [wmunck@davismunck.com](mailto:wmunck@davismunck.com).

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees connected with this communication or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0208.

Respectfully submitted,

DAVIS MUNCK, P.C.

Date:

Feb 10, 2006



William A. Munck

Registration No. 39,308

P.O. Drawer 800889

Dallas, Texas 75380

Tel: (972) 628-3600

Fax: (972) 628-3616

E-mail: [wmunck@davismunck.com](mailto:wmunck@davismunck.com)

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning  
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

**BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES**

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ BLACK BORDERS
- ☐ IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- ☐ FADED TEXT OR DRAWING
- ☐ BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING
- ☐ SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- ☐ COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS
- ☐ GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS
- ☒ LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT
- ☐ REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY
- ☐ OTHER: \_\_\_\_\_

**IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.**

**As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.**